



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,979	12/10/2003	Anilkumar Gunturu	350078.412	6437
34554 7590 10/16/2008 SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400 SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092				
EXAMINER				
DINH, KHANH Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2451				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/731,979

**Applicant(s)**

GUNTURU, ANILKUMAR

**Examiner**

Khanh Dinh

**Art Unit**

2151

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-19, 21-31 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13, 15-19 and 21-30 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 and 31 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/23/08  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is in response to the Request for Continued Examination filed on 11/6/2007. Claims 1-31 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-19, 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeBettencourt et al, US Pub. No.2005/0060372 A1 (hereafter DeBettencourt) in view of Scott et al, US Pub. No.2004/0019633 A1.

As to claim 1, DeBettencourt discloses method, comprising:

examining a packet to determine if the packet contains extensible markup language

(XML)-related content (monitoring incoming data using stream sensor, see abstract, fig.4, [0054] to [0056]);

if XML-related content is determined to be contained in said packet, matching that XML-related content to a specific ones of said rules and undertaking said routing an action specified by the rule (monitoring incoming XML message according with the rules, see [0055] to [0061]). DeBettencourt does not specifically disclose storing a plurality of bit masks, said bit masks respectively to rules that each specify a corresponding routing action and using specific ones of

said stored bit masks that respectively correspond to said matching rules to determine a routing action to perform on the packet. Scott in the same network environment discloses storing a plurality of bit masks, said bit masks respectively to rules that each specify a corresponding routing action and using specific ones of said stored bit masks that respectively correspond to said matching rules to determine a routing action to perform on the packet (encoding the files using bit masks, see abstract, fig.3, [0025] and [0028] to [0068]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scott's teachings into the computer system of DeBettencourt to encode web procedure call and service because it would have been encoded data to be passed between devices to various servers in a communication network.

As to claim 2, DeBettencourt discloses determining said particular routing action includes determining which server to forward the packet (see [0062] to [0066] and [0074] to [0077]).

As to claims 3 and 4, DeBettencourt discloses examining the packet includes at least one of examining a header of the packet and examining a body of the packet and wherein examining the packet includes reading the packet to determine if any at least one of an XML tag and an XML attribute is present therein (see [0081] to [0086] and [0095] to [0096]).

As to claims 5 and 6, DeBettencourt discloses examining the packet includes examining a request to determine if the request includes an indication of an XML representation of a resource

Art Unit: 2151

being requested and wherein examining the packet includes examining a hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) packet (see fig.11, [0098] to [0101]).

As to claims 7 and 8, DeBettencourt discloses examining the HTTP packet includes examining a simple object access protocol (SOAP) message in the HTTP packet to determine if the SOAP message encapsulates XML-related content and decrypting the packet prior to examining the packet (see [0038] to [0040] and [0102]).

As to claims 9 and 10, DeBettencourt discloses examining the packet includes examining XML root and node elements of the packet to identify content that can be matched to at least one rule and said specific rules from a plurality of simple rules that can be related to one another to form a complex rule, wherein at least one of the simple rules is specific to XML-related content (see [0062] to [0066] and [0074] to [0077]).

As to claim 11, DeBettencourt discloses particular routing action including at least one of performing a delayed binding operation and buffering packets until information for load balancing is received, load balancing multiple XML applications, differentiating service of packets based on their XML-related content, and prioritizing transactions based on XML-related content of packets (see [0081] to [0086] and [0095] to [0097]).

As to claim 13, DeBettencourt discloses a method, comprising:  
examining a packet to identify XML related content present in said packet (monitoring incoming

XML data using stream sensor, see abstract, fig.4, [0054] to [0056]);

comparing said identified XML related content in said packet with a set of rules to identify specific ones of the rules that match said related XML content, said rules in said set each specify a perform on said packet (monitoring incoming XML message according with the rules, see [0055] to [0061]).

DeBettencourt does not specifically disclose using specific ones of said stored bit masks that respectively correspond to said matching rules to determine a routing action to perform on the packet. Scott in the same network environment discloses using specific ones of said stored bit masks that respectively correspond to said matching rules to determine a routing action to perform on the packet (encoding the files using bit masks, see abstract, fig.3, [0025] and [0028] to [0068]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Scott's teachings into the computer system of DeBettencourt to encode web procedure call and service because it would have been encoded data to be passed between devices to various servers in a communication network.

As to claim 15, DeBettencourt discloses examining the packet to identify XML related content includes examining at least one of header and body portions of the packet to locate either or both an XML tag and an XML attribute (see [0081] to [0086] and [0095] to [0096]).

As to claims 16 and 17, DeBettencourt discloses comparing the data from the XML related content with the set of rules includes at least one of comparing a string in either or both the XML tag and XML attribute, or comparing a string marked by either or both the XML tag and XML

attribute, with the set of rules and storing a set of commands that specify a manner in which the packet is to be examined (see [0062] to [0066] and [0074] to [0077]).

As to claim 18, DeBettencourt discloses storing a plurality of first rules, at least some of which are associated with the XML related content and at least some of which are not associated with the XML related content and defining a plurality of second rules, at least some of which are made up of several first rules and specifying for each of said second rules a respective routing action to undertake if content of packets match the second rules (see [0081] to [0086] and [0095] to [0096]).

Claims 19, 21-22 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 13, 18 and 1 respectively.

As to claim 23, DeBettencourt discloses means for examining the packet includes at least one of a means for examining a header of the packet and a means for examining a body of the packet, such means for examining the header and body of the packet including at least one of a means for reading the packet to determine if any at least one of an XML tag and an XML attribute is present therein (see [0081] to [0086] and [0095] to [0096]).

As to claim 24, DeBettencourt discloses means for decrypting the packet if the packet includes encrypted content (see [0102] and [0169] to [0171]).

As to claim 25, DeBettencourt discloses means for storing plural ones of said rule each respectively specifying a different routing action to apply to said packet (see [0102] and [0169] to [0171]).

Claims 26-29 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 12, 11, 1 and 8 respectively.

As to claim 30, DeBettencourt discloses a data structure accessible by the processor to store rules that specify actions to undertake if certain XML-related content is present in packets (see [0062] to [0066] and [0074] to [0077]).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 12 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13, 15-19, 21-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.



***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**  
Commissioner for patents  
P O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

/Khanh Dinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2151